SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 6 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © April 1, 1995

Research Agencies Face Big Budget-Cutting Spree

The science chiefs in Washington are fearful and puzzled this springtime as House Republicans march on with their budget-cutting drive and the Clinton Administration hurries to keep up with spending cuts of its own. Partial salvation might after all come from the Senate, which is showing some hesitation about this destruction derby. But nothing is for sure, and a looming risk is an uncontrolled frenzy of deficit-cutting mayhem late in the Congressional session.

Last week, in the second round of the Clinton-Gore reinvention of government (REGO II), the White House announced further spending reductions for NASA, already bled into near-decrepitude by the misbegotten Shuttle and Space Station and a long succession of previous budget reductions. Over the next five years, the President announced, NASA will have to get on with $5 billion less than was specified in its latest long-range spending plan.

Meanwhile, the National Science Foundation has been asked by its House Appropriations Subcommittee to consider how it would deal with a 20-percent budget reduction—a figure that translates into about $650 million in next year's budget. NSF Director Neal Lane said he would have to think about it, but observed that a reduction on that scale would cause major disruptions in the cash-strapped Foundation.

National Biological Service Gets Unfriendly Reception in House—P. 4

Two weeks ago, the House Budget Committee, in a long list of what it labeled "illustrative" spending cuts, proposed a $500-million reduction in next year's budget of the National Institutes of Health—rather than the $500 million increase requested by the White House. To the end of the century, the Committee proposed keeping NIH spending flat—with no adjustments for inflation. Encountering NIH Director Harold Varmus during a break in the NIH Appropriations hearings, SGR got his assessment. "It would be catastrophic," he said.

With the House taking a harsh stand and the Senate a good deal less hostile, still to be settled is the fate of the Clinton Administration's biggest innovation in federal research policy, the so-called industrial partnership programs financed by the Pentagon and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Both are in the Republican cross hairs.

By a vote of 262-165 on March 22, current funding for NIST's Advanced Technology Program was reduced by $107 million in the House; the Senate took back only $32 million. The Pentagon's Technology Reinvestment Project was essentially wiped out in the House, while the Senate cut it by about

(Continued on Page 2)

US Department of Science? Old Idea Gets a New Look

Republican vows to abolish several cabinet-level government departments have revived interest in establishing a wide-ranging federal Department of Science as a homebase for their research-related activities.

The Department of Science concept has floated around Washington for decades without attracting serious support. Science chiefs have been wary of centralizing power under a single cabinet secretary, with presumably a matching concentration of power in Congressional committees and their powerful, frequently imperious, chairmen.

The agencies that would go into the proposed department have preferred familiar territory to the uncertainties of relocation and reorganization. The big argument in favor is that a seat in the President's cabinet would provide critical

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.), Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for NIH, apologized for a bad cold and a raspy voice as he opened the annual budget hearing for the agency on March 14. Instant response from NIH Director Harold Varmus, seated at the witness table: "We can help you with that."

Gloomy about prospects in general, the biomedical camp sees some hope in Porter, a strong supporter of NIH when Republicans were in the minority on the Subcommittee. There's a need to cut, Porter said at the hearing, but added, "I'm confident Congress will look at priorities and recognize the importance of biomedical research."

Flaunting its budget macho, the White House recently issued budget projections to the year 2000. They show NIH, now at $11.3 billion, dropping to $10.7 billion; NSF would go from the present $3.1 billion to $2.9 billion. Deduct inflation, conservatively estimated at 3-4 percent (though it's usually considered higher for research activities), and the "real" reductions are far bigger than the numbers indicate. They're only projections, in a process that works year by year, but the proliferating downward estimates are acquiring an aura of inevitability.

Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary has ordered a year-long review of the Department's security classification policies, first of its kind in 50 years, she says. O'Leary has inspired the public release of mountains of classified records, and now aims to rewrite the policies that locked them away. The review will be headed by Albert Narath, Director of the Sandia National Laboratories. For further information: Gerald Gibson, Office of Declassification, NN-52/GTN, DOE, Washington, DC 20582; tel. 301/903-3680; fax (301) 903-6133.

. . . Basic Research Comes First, Walker Tells PCAST

(Continued from Page 1)

50 percent.

Washington's season of budget slashing was the main topic at the latest meeting of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), March 27-28, in Washington. The 18-member committee, meeting for the second time since its establishment last year, was invited by Presidential S&T Advisor John Gibbons to speak its mind about current issues. The responses reflected dismay with the assault on research budgets.

Charles A. Saunders, Chairman of the giant Glaxo, Inc., pharmaceutical firm, expressed concern about "flat-funding of biomedical research," and urged special consideration for younger investigators.

Phillip Sharp, Head of Biology at MIT, reported that "two major Boston teaching hospitals" (not named) were planning to cut expenditures 30 percent across the board—including training and research. With NIH in trouble, Sharp warned, great difficulties were shaping up for biomedical research.

Hopes for academic assistance from the pharmaceutical industry were discounted by David A. Hamburg, President of the Carnegie Corporation. Hamburg recalled that when he was President of the Institute of Medicine, a suggestion that the industry put more money "upstream" in the research process brought a curt response: "It's not our job."

Charles Vest, President of MIT, expressed fear that budget cuts at NASA, Defense, and other mission agencies would severely hurt engineering research and education.

A plea for the industrial partnership programs was made by Lillian Shiao-Yen Wu, a researcher at IBM's Thomas J. Watson Research Center. Praising NIST's Advanced Technology Program (ATP) for encouraging collaboration "between the business side and the research side," she added, "We're very concerned about keeping IBM alive."

Gibbons' co-Chair on PCAST, John Young, former CEO of Hewlett-Packard, said that ATP has been misrepresented as a government attempt "to pick winners and losers."

Peter Raven, Director of the Missouri Botanical Garden, warned of impending and neglected environmental crises. Scientists, he said, must put on a campaign to "overcome the drive to cut spending."

The assembled mandarins then took up a misguided theme popular in their ranks—that science's fiscal misfortunes are attributable to public ignorance of science.

The public thinks "things will work out," Nobel physicist Murray Gell-Mann explained. Sally Ride, Director of the California Space Institute, said that, "broadly speaking, the public is uneducated in science issues."

Agreeing, Gibbons lamented "poor delivery of the message," and called for "a more productive dialog." He noted, too, that PCAST can get its message to the President.

Virginia Weldon, the Monsanto Company's Senior Vice President for Public Policy, said scientists must get a message to both parties: "These are things we're worried about. Don't mess it up."

Gibbons suggested preparation of a collective PCAST statement, which upon release the next day, turned out to be a mild declaration of concern. Science is important, it said, for prosperity, health, security. Other countries are investing heavily, while the US is cutting back. "We must lead the pack or lose the race—and the jobs that go with it," the statement said, adding: "In the face of mounting pressure to reduce science and technology spending, PCAST supports our national commitment to maintain a robust R&D portfolio."

Addressing the meeting on its second day were Chairman Robert Walker (R-Pa.) of the House Science Committee, and his predecessor in the chair, Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), both frequent performers on the science-policy talk circuit.

Repeating his standard talk, Walker said the need for spending cuts necessitates firm priority setting in research, and expressed a preference for basic research over the industrial partnership programs. He also said that rather than focusing on R&D spending by government, his camp of Republicans was thinking in terms of the overall national economy and how it could contribute to R&D. Tax credits for business contributions for academic facilities would be one way, he said. But, in any case, government should concentrate on basic research, Walker insisted, though not to the exclusion of applied research.

Brown, repeating his standard jokes about adjusting to minority status in Congress, said he somewhat agreed with Walker, but not completely. The US, he said, must decide on the government's proper role in research. As things are going, he said, the US is on the way to becoming "a second or third-rate country."

Norman Augustine, President of the newly amalgamated Lockheed Martin Corporation, recalled how Wall Street turned its back on his old company, Martin Marietta, when stock analysts learned of its plans for expanding research. Because of distant payoffs, he said, "they didn't want investment in research." If companies cut back, Augustine warned, "we must find a way for government and industry to pick up the slack."

Congressman Brown responded, "That ain't going to happen, Norm. They're all going downhill together."—DSG

© 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher **Daniel S. Greenberg**
Associate Publisher **Wanda J. Reif**
Circulation Manager **Glen D. Grant**

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $455.00 (two years, $780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . Plans for Science Department Face Many Hurdles

(Continued from Page 1)

mass, visibility, and political influence for science. But skeptics note that cabinet rank isn't what it used to be in American government.

The current interest in the Department is tied directly to the politics of demolition raging in Washington. With Republicans and Democrats competing to demonstrate antipathy to government, there's a lot of talk about eliminating or combining departments. High on the Republican departmental termination list are Commerce and Energy, homebases of many research programs. If the departments are eliminated, havens will be required for their surviving activities.

The leading champion of the Department of Science, Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pa.), Chairman of the House Science Committee, has been promoting the idea in many recent talks around Washington, and says legislation for that goal is now being drafted. Last year, when he was the top Republican on the Committee, he introduced a departmental bill that went no place. But as Science Chairman, Vice Chairman of the House Budget Committee, and confidante of House Speaker Gingrich, Walker commands attention.

Though there are differences in the various formulations offered in recent years for a Department of Science, the unity plans have usually involved many of the same agencies.

At the core are two big independents, the National Science Foundation and NASA, which would contribute only its research-related functions, leaving space operations where they are.

Then there's the Department of Energy Office of Energy Research, which is the mainstay for high-energy physics and many other areas of the physical sciences.

Two Commerce Department agencies would be taken into the department, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Various other odds and ends have been included in departmental plans, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the US Geological Survey.

Almost invariably left out of the proposed Department are three that account for over half of federal R&D spending: the Pentagon, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Agriculture.

The omission has nothing to do with wise structuring, but arises from the peculiarities of Congressional jurisdictions. This year, as often in the past, enthusiasm for establishing a Department of Science has originated in the House Science Committee, which already has jurisdiction over most of the agencies that would be taken into the new department. It is a fact of Congressional life that the committees that write legislation for defense, health, and agriculture will never let them go.

The latest from Walker's Science Committee is that a draft bill should be ready next month. In this matter, the only certainty at this point is that whatever happens, if anything at all, will not happen quickly. The basic structure of the federal science establishment has been remarkably hardy.

Little has changed since the creation of NASA, by Act of Congress, in 1958, and the Environmental Protection Agency, through a Presidential reorganization, in 1970. The transformation of the National Bureau of Standards into NIST, by legislation in 1988, came with many Democratic industrial-aid ambitions written into the law. But little happened under those provisions until Clinton took office. Now the new Republican majorities are committed to wiping out or severely reducing the new NIST programs.

A petulant Nixon eliminated the White House Science Office in 1973, but two years later, Congress put it back. The most recent reworking of the federal science structure took place in 1993, when the Interior Department fashioned the National Biological Service from existing agencies. And that creation has been in deep political trouble from the day it started [see P. 4].

The rarity of change in the federal science establishment is striking, so much so, in fact, that it is reasonable to suspect that the system is bound by a devotion to the status quo that spans science and politics.

Technology Report Card

With Republicans chopping down its industrial-research programs, this is no time for the White House to trumpet that American technology is in pretty good shape. But it is, and therefore the latest official report card on US high-tech blends the good news with dire warnings.

The *National Critical Technologies Report*, mandated by Congress, states that the US "is either at parity or in the lead in almost every technology area identified." But it goes on to state that "the size of the US lead has either declined or remained constant between 1990 and 1994, which argues for continued US investment in technology if the US position is to be preserved."

National Critical Technologies Report (197 pp., no charge), order from: Critical Technologies Institute, Rand, attn. Linda Tanner, 2100 M St. NW, Washington, DC 20037; tel. 202/296-5000, ext. 5692; fax 202/452-8377.

Taking this situation one step further, Presidential Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons is quoted in an accompanying White House press release as saying: "This report documents the very tenuous lead we maintain in many of the technologies critical to our military and economic well-being at the very same time the new Congressional leadership proposes to gut the very core of our strategy to preserve American preeminence in critical areas."

The report was prepared by the Critical Technologies Institute, a branch of Rand that works for the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

National Biological Service Makes Plea for Survival

One of the brightest innovations in the federal science establishment in many years, the fledgling National Biological Service (NBS), appeared before its money masters in the House last month to plead not for money, but for survival.

The outcome, however, looks dim on that side of the Capitol, where Republicans gush with animosity toward this upstart creation of the abhorred Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, homebase of the NBS. Economizing is secondary in this case, which involves a budget request of $172 million—not inconsequential for the anti-spenders, but scarcely big money. What's going on here is an ideological blood feud.

The political right considers Babbitt an environmental fanatic, and regards the NBS as his insidious creation for favoring bugs, birds, and other low-value creatures over private property rights and economic development. In 1993, when Congress balked at establishing the NBS by statute, Babbitt invoked his departmental powers to bring it into being administratively, principally by transferring to NBS 1180 scientists in the Fish and Wildlife Service and 154 in the National Park Service.

The end run around Congress "left a bad taste," Rep. Jim Kolbe (R-Arizona) declared at the hearing, adding that he wasn't favorably impressed with environmental studies NBS conducted in his state. Rep. Charles H. Taylor (R-NC) complained of "arrogance in the way this was put together a year ago."

The NBS was listed for termination last year in Republican budget plans for implementing the Contract With America, and it showed up again March 16 on a long list of "Illustrative Republican Spending Cuts" issued by the House Budget Committee. NBS and its friends got the message not long after the agency's birth, and have been deeply deferential to its Congressional overseers, even to the extent of softening the original name of the organization.

It started out as the National Biological *Survey*, a title that matched that of a companion Interior agency, the US Geological Survey. But after opponents fixed on the issue of NBS intruding on private lands to conduct biological surveys, the name was quietly altered to the National Biological *Service*.

Testifying before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Interior Assistant Secretary George T. Frampton Jr. and NBS Director H. Ronald Pulliam assured skeptical Republicans that the NBS is not the intrusive police organization depicted by its detractors. It's a scientific research agency, they insisted, dedicated to studying the nation's biological resources, and increasingly attentive to foreseeing rather than responding to environmental crises.

They also pleaded for kindness on the grounds that NBS is rigorously scientific and has no regulatory authority. Therefore, they said, its findings are pure, and untainted by political considerations.

Frampton also told the Subcommittee that those who fear regulation should find assurance in the performance of the agency. "NBS has shifted the focus," he said, "from reacting to the latest endangered species crisis or alarming change in wildlife habitats, to research on species and areas of concern that have not yet reached a crisis point and can still be addressed effectively through management and planning solutions outside of a regulatory context."

Frampton and Director Pulliam assured the Subcommittee that the NBS has been scrupulously attentive to Congressional directives to refrain from research on private lands without first obtaining written permission from the owners. Frampton addressed another concern of the anti-NBS contingent, reporting that the agency's research "has actually led to fewer listings under the Endangered Species Act." Data provided by NBS researchers, he said, demonstrated that "the Alabama Sturgeon is not a genetically distinct species, and that the bristle-thighed curlew in Alaska is not endangered."

But the going was rough for the agency. Rep. George R. Nethercutt Jr. (R-Washington) appeared overflowing with disbelief about the case offered by the Interior officials. Referring to other agencies with environmental responsibilities, he raised the menace of "duplication," and fretted about "so many people in the federal system doing research."

Pulliam acknowledged that other agencies work on environmental topics, but, with NBS serving as orchestrator, their efforts are coordinated for the first time, he assured Nethercutt. Frampton interjected that "if you break up NBS, it will be back to the old system." Nethercutt appeared unsatisfied, observing that the spending of the various agencies is "getting bigger, and bigger, and bigger."

Nethercutt continued to fence with Pulliam and Frampton, until Rep. Sid Yates (D-Illinois) asked him, "What could they do to convince you?" Nethercutt didn't answer.

A helping hand was offered by Rep. David E. Skaggs (D-Colorado), who told the two Interior officials, "If you're headed for the gallows, I want to understand your crime." Skaggs observed that NBS hadn't done anything that wasn't being done by Interior agencies prior to its creation, adding that the move to abolish NBS reflects the policy of "ignorance is bliss."

The Chairman of the Subcommittee, Rep. Ralph Regula (R-Ohio), seemed to have some difficulty in keeping up with the dialog, and left most of the questioning to his colleagues. The few questions he asked mainly concerned money and priorities within the agency.

Nethercutt came back into the discussion to inquire whether NBS would ever finish its work. Is it a "permanent agency?" he asked Pulliam, who replied that a lot of work remains to be done.

Also joining in was Rep. Norman D. Dicks (D-Washington), who, while describing himself as an environmental "moderate" and a supporter of NBS, lectured Pulliam and Frampton on the woes of the lumbering industry in his state. "The preservationist model," the Congressman declared, "is abhorrent to nature."

Commentary: Is the Private Sector Really Better?

In this high season of government bashing, some attention should be given to a neglected reality, namely, that personal incompetence and organizational asininity are probably about evenly distributed across the public and private sectors.

A different impression arises from the corresponding political broadsides of Republicans and Democrats as they compete in denunciations of government and in adulation of business, industry, and the virtues of profit-seeking.

Clinton and Gore insist that government is so bloated and inefficient that it must be reinvented, a process that seems to consist of retiring and firing a lot of people. Calling for stronger remedies, Gingrich and company are smashing at major segments of the federal establishment with a wrecker's ball. From the US Geological Survey to the Departments of Energy and Commerce, termination or severe scaling down is their remedy.

That's the only way, they contend, to free the private sector from the death grip of government regulation and cruel taxes. Once liberated, free enterprise, energized by the competitive marketplace, will flourish for the benefit of all—or so the theory goes.

The contrasting views of public bumbling and private efficiency invite some skepticism. Government organizations generally perform on a public stage, and therefore have difficulty concealing their stumbles and incompetencies from the press and Congress, often assisted by leaks from aggrieved, whistle-blowing insiders. Large categories of Federal documents are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Private corporations, on the other hand, maintain a tight grip on their strategic deliberations, day-to-day workings, and sensitive papers.

When the Pentagon overpays for a toilet seat, we hear about it. But the private sector is indeed private, and its catastrophes usually remain in the family—until they swell to colossal scales that defy concealment even by skilled public-relations artists.

The Ford Edsel, firmly enshrined in the folklore of corporate folly, is perhaps the best known of such occurrences. But enough giant missteps of that nature have come to light to cast doubt on the cult of private-sector worship now running loose in Washington. The reality is that neither sector possesses unalloyed brilliance in managing complex affairs.

IBM, for decades the unassailable leader and profit-maker of the revolution in information management, guessed wrong on the irresistible advantages of the personal computer, stuck to its mainframes, and lost billions in the process. Xerox missed out on the computer age, ignoring its own researchers, though they were in the vanguard of computer innovators. General Motors is just returning to profitability after years of losses in the multi-billion-dollars range.

Several major department store chains are in bankruptcy, blindsided by changes in taste, shopping habits, and the discount revolution. The savings and loan debacles were abetted by government regulations that invited wild gambling with other people's money, but the hands-on perpetrators were solidly rooted in the private sector.

The Monsanto Company spent over a decade, and a billion or more dollars, to develop a bioengineered cow hormone, Posilac, to increase the production of milk—a commodity whose great over-supply plagues governments around the world. Despite a strong promotional push by Monsanto, consumer resistance and skepticism on the farm have held first-year sales to about $70 million, a poor return on investment, according to a recent account in the *New York Times*. Meanwhile, at considerable cost, several other companies are developing their own versions of the milk-boosting hormone, even as the pioneering firm on the market experiences poor sales.

Cheerleaders for the private sector would have a carnival if government agencies were responsible for these episodes. But as corporate ventures, they're excused on the grounds that losses and other disappointments are solely the business of the companies involved. That's capitalism, according to dogma, and we're all supposed to be better off for it.

But tell that to the retirees who saw their IBM nest eggs reduced by two thirds, or to the thousands of Big Blue employes who lost their supposedly lifetime jobs because management guessed wrong about computer trends.

When a big corporation makes dumb choices that lead to financial ruination, the damage is not confined to the company. It spreads to employes, stockholders, the surrounding community, and ultimately to all taxpayers through loss of tax revenues and the frequent need for assistance to the afflicted.

Would government decision-makers have performed any better in handling these corporate matters that went so bad? Given their track record with big problems that require foresight and management of complex affairs, there's no reason to think so. From the US Postal Service to the lack of long-range storage for nuclear waste and the CIA's failure to foresee the collapse of the Soviet Union, monuments to flops in government are abundant. But that's no excuse for the wave of fantasies about the competence of the private sector, where failures tend to be quietly buried, unless they're too big for concealment.

By and large, the capacity for getting it wrong appears to be evenly spread around.—DSG

News Notes: Mexican Council, Federal R&D Jobs

As if it doesn't already have enough troubles, Mexico now has a counterpart of the US National Research Council, the so-called working arm of the Washington-based National Academy of Sciences.

Titled the *Fundacion Nacional de Investigacion*, the new organization will be the "working arm" of Mexico's National Academy of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, according to an announcement from the US Academy, which says the idea for a Mexican version arose during a joint study of Mexico City's water supply.

Opinions differ on the utility of the US National Research Council. One knowledgeable line of thought holds that it is an enterprise that keeps busy people busier, producing reports that often aren't completed until those who ordered them have retired, been defeated, or died.

The federal workforce of scientists grew substantially between 1989-93, while overall, the ranks of federal engineers declined a bit, and both groups aged slightly, on average, according to the National Science Foundation.

The workforce numbers today are almost surely much lower, since the cutoff year for the NSF report was the beginning of the federal "downsizing" movement under the Clinton-Gore drive to "reinvent" government.

NSF reports that during the 1989-93 span, federal employment of scientists rose 13.2 percent, while the number of engineers dropped 0.5 percent.

The report (SRS Data Brief No. 4; 4 pp., no charge), prepared by John Tsapogas, is available from: NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, Suite 965, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1780; fax 703/306-0510.

At Last for NSF's Board?

The political process is moving closer to filling seven of eight vacancies dating back to last May on the 24-member National Science Board, policymaking body for the National Science Foundation.

The White House, rarely spry about filling such inconspicuous positions, sent the nominations in January to the Senate, which also moves slowly in these matters. Last week the Labor and Human Resources Committee got around to rubber stamping the nominations, which usually means they're a shoo-in for confirmation on the floor. Membership on the the Board, which assembles about once a month for two-day meetings, entails a fair amount of work and not all who are approached are willing to take it on.

The nominees, who have all been serving in non-voting consulting status, are:

Sanford Greenberg, a Washington, DC, businessman, inventor, and philanthropist.

Eve L. Menger, Director of Technology, Corning, Inc.

Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, Dean and Vice Chancellor for Graduate Programs, UCLA.

Diana S. Natalicio, President, University of Texas, El Paso.

Robert M. Solow, Nobel Laureate economist, MIT.

Warren M. Washington, Director, Climate and Global Dynamics Division, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado.

John A. White, Dean of the College of Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Word from the White House is that work continues on filling the eighth vacancy on the Board.

Job Changes & Appointments

Jerome G. Green, Director of the Division of Research Grants at the National Institutes of Health, went on leave last week en route to official retirement in June. Green headed the Division for 9 years, and prior to that spent 31 years at the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, where he was Director of Extramural Research.

Also at NIH, ***Harold C. Slavkin***, Director of the Center for Craniofacial Molecular Biology, University of Southern California School of Dentistry, has been appointed Director of the National Institute of Dental Research, starting in July. He succeeds ***Harald Loe***, who retired last June. Appointed Director of the National Institute of Nursing Research: ***Patricia Grady***, PhD, RN, currently Deputy Director of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. The Nursing Institute has been headed on an acting basis by ***Susan S. Hurd*** since last June, when the founding Director, ***Ada Sue Hinshaw***, stepped down.

John Maddox, Editor of the British weekly *Nature*, plans to retire in November, when he will reach age 70. Maddox held the post from 1966-73 and from 1980 to the present. A skilled journalist, untiring controversialist, and connoisseur of research, Maddox was knighted in January. Macmillan Magazines Ltd., publisher of *Nature*, says it has "held discussions with a number of potential successors."

At *Science*, the editorship changes May 1, when ***Daniel E. Koshland Jr.*** retires after a decade on the job. His successor is ***Floyd Bloom***, Chairman of the Department of Neuropharmacology at the Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, Calif. Like his predecessor at the journal, Bloom will hold the editorial job on a half-time basis.

Michael E. Kirk, Deputy Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, has been appointed Executive Director of the American Intellectual Property Law Association. Kirk played a major role in drafting the intellectual property provisions in the recently approved GATT treaty.

David Goldston, Project Director for a major R&D-policy study at the Council on Competitiveness, will join the staff of Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY) as Legislative Director on May 1.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From the Institute of Medicine (IOM):

Review of the Fialuridine (FIAU) Clinical Trials (269 pp., $34, plus $4 for shipping), says five deaths in 1993 in the NIH trial of the anti-hepatitis drug were not due to faulty procedures or lack of proper surveillance. The conclusion is at odds with a Task Force of the Food and Drug Administration, which the IOM report unpersuasively belittles, stating, "Its membership was intentionally restricted to avoid introducing bias..." The IOM report questions the FDA recommendations for closer scrutiny of side effects in drug trials, describing them as costly and impractical. The IOM committee that wrote the report was chaired by Morton Swartz, Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School. Frederick J. Manning of the IOM staff was Study Director.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242; in the Washington, DC, area: 202/334-3313.

From the Israeli Ministry of Science and the Arts:

Science in Israel 1994-5: A Practical Guide (53 pp., no charge), describes R&D organizations, in academe, government and industry, and tells how to get in touch with them.

Order from: Ministry of Science and the Arts, PO Box 18195, Jerusalem 91181, Israel; tel. 972-2/847-096; fax 972-2/825-581; e-mail danny@lincrd.bitnet

---

From the National Academy of Sciences:

Interim Report of the Committee on Research and Peer Review in EPA (36 pp., no charge, supply limited), a largely favorable assessment of steps toward strengthening the long-term scientific program of the Environmental Protection Agency, often criticized for concentrating research on crisis management. The report, requested last year by Congress, notes an increase in "fundamental and anticipatory research," from 30 percent to at least half of activities in EPA's Office of Research and Development, budgeted this year for $378 million in extramural grants, contracts, and interagency programs. Funding for extramural, investigator-initiated, peer-reviewed research is going from $21 million to $100 million, and EPA will underwrite 300 graduate fellowships. The report expresses concern about the place of scientists in EPA's pecking order, noting there's no chief of science for the whole agency "and no scientist has ever served as EPA administrator"—the present EPA head is an attorney. Concern is also expressed about fiscal pressures on EPA's inhouse research as emphasis is placed on the extramural program.

Paul G. Risser, President of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, chaired the committee that produced this interim report; a final one is due next year. James J. Reisa, of the Academy staff, was Principal Staff Officer for the report.

Order from: Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, National Academy of Sciences, Room HA-345, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-2378; fax 202/334-2752.

From the American Enterprise Institute (AEI):

The 1993-1994 Debate on Health Care Reform: Did the Polls Mislead the Policy Makers? (42 pp., $9.95), presents the results of 22 major opinion surveys, and concludes that the failed Clinton health-care plan was out of harmony with majority public sentiments on deficiencies in health care and how to correct them. The author, Karlyn Bowman, an AEI resident fellow, says the polls show concern about health care but doubts about government-led remedies.

The report does not discuss the massive propaganda barrages directed at the Clinton plan by numerous interests in the medical trough.

Order from: Publisher Resources, Inc., 1224 Heil Quaker Blvd., La Vergne, Tenn. 37086; tel. 1-800/269-6267; fax 1-800/774-6733; outside the US: 202/862-5875.

From the Battelle Memorial Institute:

The State-Federal Technology Partnership: Symposium Proceedings (74 pp., no charge), summaries of papers, names of attendees, and press reports from a meeting in January in Washington at which collaboration between the two sectors was extolled and cheered on as the next big phase in the flowering of technology [SGR, February 1]. Sponsored by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the resurrected Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government, the meeting had the warm blessings of the White House, represented by Presidential Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons, who delivered the keynote address. Battelle, long involved with the partnership program, serves as homebase for many of its activities.

Order from: Chris Coburn, Vice President, Battelle Memorial Institute, 25000 Great Northern Corporate Center, Suite 260, Cleveland, Ohio 44070; tel. 216/734-0094; fax 216/734-0686; e-mail coburnc@battelle.org

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, $455.00 ☐
two years, $780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, $35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, $15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill
Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp.date _____

_____
Signature

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the National Science Foundation:

FY 1994 Awards by State and Institution (NSF 95-42; 74 pp., no charge), reports on the distribution of the approximately 20,000 awards for research and education-related activities made by NSF in the fiscal year that ended last September 30. California got the most, $367 million, followed by New York, $238 million; Massachusetts, $214 million, and Colorado, $211 million. High on the list of academic recipients: MIT, $48 million; UC Berkeley, $47 million; Stanford, $38 million; University of Colorado, Boulder, and Columbia University, $32 million each; Caltech and U. of Minnesota, Twin Cities, $30 million each.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, Room 1245, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1070; fax 703/644-4278.

From the National Academy of Sciences:

Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 1993 (99 pp., no charge), latest in a series dating back to 1958, reports that the number of new PhDs hit a record 39,754 in 1993, with women receiving 38 percent of the total, up from 11 percent in 1963. In that same period, the share awarded to non-US citizens rose from 13 to 32 percent. Among the foreign recipients, the largest number were from the People's Republic of China, 19 percent, followed by Taiwan and Korea, each with 12 percent, and India, 9 percent. US citizens received more than three-quarters of the doctorates in the social sciences, humanities, and education, while non-US citizens received 59 percent of the PhDs in engineering and 45 percent in the physical sciences. Delores H. Thurgood, of the Academy staff, was Senior Research Associate for the report.

Order from: Doctorate Research Project, National Academy of Sciences, OSEP-Room TJ 2006, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-3161; fax 202/334-2753.

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

Tax-Exempt Organizations: Information on Selected Types of Organizations (GAO/GGD-95-84BR; 72 pp.), a fiscal glimpse of several major categories in the non-profit sector, as defined by section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. The GAO report deals mainly with three of the Code's 25 tax-exempt categories: business leagues, 501(c)(6); social-welfare organizations 501(c)(4); and labor and agricultural organizations 501(c)(5), with a brief discussion of the type most common among science-related organizations, 501(c)(3). According to the GAO, non-profiting is, overall, a moderate-growth industry, with the number of organizations in all categories rising from 806,375 to 1,022,223 between 1978 and 1990. In three main categories of the GAO study, 15 percent of the organizations' executives received at least $200,000 in compensation in 1992, while 29 percent worked gratis. Among 1992 compensation listed (by title, without names): Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Executive Director, $255,993; Chemical Institute of Technology, President, $278,848; American Society of Hospital Pharmacists, Executive Vice President, $458,773; Association for Manufacturing Technology, President, $346,047.

US Agriculture: Status of the Farm Sector (GAO/RCED-95-104FS; 43 pp.), basic data on farming in America, requested by the Chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate agriculture committees, in expectation this year of the first rewriting of major farm legislation since 1991. Among the topics: the "on-farm" sector's share of gross domestic product (3.9 percent in 1960; 1.4 percent in 1992); ranking of commodities in cash receipts (cattle and calves at the top, rice and sugar cane at the bottom); distribution of farm income (half had sales under $10,000 in 1992, while 2 percent of farms had sales over $500,000 and accounted for almost half of all sales).

Early Childhood Programs: Promoting the Development of Young Children in Denmark, France, and Italy (GAO/HEHS-95-45BR; 36 pp.) reports favorably on the European programs in comparison to their American counterparts, presenting data showing that enrollments and educational quality, including teacher training and facilities, are higher than in the US, fees are low and adjusted to income, and staff are generally paid better and turn over less. The highest marks in the report are given to the Italian municipality of Reggio Emilia, a left-wing (former Communist) stronghold, described as "recognized around the world as being a leader in early childhood practice." The report was requested by Senator Christopher Dodd, of Connecticut, senior Democrat on the Children and Families Subcommittee of the Labor and Human Resources Committee. Previous GAO reports on children's programs are listed.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA):

COSSA Washington Update (twice monthly; $65 per year for individuals; $130 for institutions), newsletter of the Washington outpost of the social and behavioral sciences, reports on developments and trends in Congress and elsewhere in the capital affecting those disciplines. The March 6 issue (34 pp., $10 per copy) summarizes the social and behavioral items, spread among 40 agencies, in the Clinton budget for the coming fiscal year. Congress has already begun to hack at many of those spending proposals, but the COSSA report provides a good picture of the existing spending patterns. COSSA's membership consists of over 90 professional organizations, scientific societies, colleges and universities, and research institutes.

Order from: COSSA, 1522 K St. NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/842-3525; fax 202/842-2788.

(Continued on Page 7)